

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-16, 18 and 20-25 are currently pending. Claims 5, 6, 10, 15, 16 and 20 have been amended herein. Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 13, 14 and 18 are canceled herein. Claims 2, 12, 17 and 19 were previously canceled. Claims 22-25 are newly added. No new matter has been added by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of these Claims are respectfully requested.

### Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated in the outstanding Office Action that Claims 5, 15, and 20 contained allowable subject matter. The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter made in the outstanding Office Action. The Claims that were indicated as containing allowable subject matter have been written in independent form and the Applicant respectfully submits that these Claims are now allowable.

### 103 Rejection

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-14, 16, 18, 19 (previously canceled) and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramanian et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,818) in view of Anwar (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,577). Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 13, 14 and 18 are canceled herein. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as are recited in Claims 6-10, 16 and 21 (the remaining rejected Claims) are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Subramanian et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,818) in view of Anwar (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,577).

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 5 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a method for transaction processing of a search transaction comprising the steps of:

- a) receiving a plurality of search queries from users,

each of said plurality of search queries including search criteria and including a user address; b) normalizing said search criteria so as to obtain normalized search criteria; ...wherein step b) further comprises: b1) comparing said search criteria from each of said queries; b2) determining commonalities between said search criteria; and b3) generating normalized search criteria, said normalized search criteria consolidated based on the commonalities determined in step b2) so as to eliminate redundant search criteria.

Independent Claims 5, 15, 16, and 20 recite limitations similar to those of Claim 5. Claims 6-10 depend from independent Claim 5, and Claim 21 depends from independent Claim 20 and set forth further limitations of the claimed invention embodiments.

Subramanian et al. does not anticipate or render obvious a method for transaction processing of a search transaction that includes normalizing a search criteria so as to obtain a single normalized search criteria for the plurality of search queries that involves “b1) comparing said search criteria from each of said queries; b2) determining commonalities between said search criteria; and b3) generating normalized search criteria, said normalized search criteria consolidated based on the commonalities determined in step b2) so as to eliminate redundant search criteria” as is recited in the Applicant’s Claims. In contrast, Subramanian et al. discloses a cost based query optimization process. Subramanian et al. teaches that the therein disclosed system modifies a query plan generated by a conventional optimizer to generate a new query plan that results in improved query performance (column 8, lines 19-25).

Nowhere does Subramanian et al. disclose or suggest the specifically defined normalization operations such as “b1) comparing said search criteria from each of said

queries; b2) determining commonalities between said search criteria; and b3) generating

normalized search criteria, said normalized search criteria consolidated based on the commonalities determined in step b2) so as to eliminate redundant search criteria” as is set forth in independent Claims 5, 15, 16, and 20. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully submits that Subramanian et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention as is set forth in Claims 5, 15, 16 and 20.

Anwar does not overcome the shortcomings of Subramanian et al. et al. outlined above. Anwar does not anticipate or render obvious a method for transaction processing of a search transaction that includes normalizing a search criteria so as to obtain a single normalized search criteria for the plurality of search queries that involves “b1) comparing said search criteria from each of said queries; b2) determining commonalities between said search criteria; and b3) generating normalized search criteria, said normalized search criteria consolidated based on the commonalities determined in step b2) so as to eliminate redundant search criteria” as is recited in the Applicant’s Claims.

By contrast, Anwar discloses a search engine with user activity memory. Anwar teaches that the therein disclosed search engine utilizes both record based data and user activity data to develop, update and refine ranking protocol and to identify words and phrases that give rise to search ambiguity so that the search engine can interact with the user to better respond to user queries and enhance data acquisitions from databases, intranets, and internets. As such, Anwar is concerned with internal processes of a search engine that enhance it’s user and data acquisition interactions.

Nowhere does Anwar disclose or suggest the specifically recited normalization operations such as “b1) comparing said search criteria from each of said queries; b2) determining commonalities between said search criteria; and b3) generating normalized search criteria, said normalized search criteria consolidated based on the commonalities determined in step b2) so as to eliminate redundant search criteria” as is set forth in independent Claims 5, 15, 16 and 20. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that Anwar and Hagmann et al. either alone or in combination do not anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention as is set forth in amended Claims 5, 15, 16 and 20.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Subramanian et al. and Anwar, either alone or in combination do not anticipate or render obvious the present Claimed invention as is recited in independent Claims 5, 15, 16 and 20 and as such Claims 5, 15, 16 and 20 overcome the Examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 5, 15, 16 and 20 are in condition for allowance. In addition, Subramanian et al. and Anwar do not anticipate or render obvious the present invention as is recited in Claims 6-10 and 21 which depend from independent Claims 5 and 20 respectively, and that Claims 6-10 and 21 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. It should be appreciated that new claims 22-25 which depend from allowable independent claims are likewise allowable.

### Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 5/21, 2004

Reginald A. Ratliff  
Reginald A. Ratliff  
Registration No. 48,098  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060